

# A note on temperature without energy - a social example

K. Kułakowski<sup>†</sup>

*Faculty of Physics and Applied Computer Science, AGH University of Science and Technology, al. Mickiewicza 30, PL-30059 Kraków, Poland*

<sup>†</sup>kulakowski@novell.ftj.agh.edu.pl

The question if the statistical mechanics can be useful in social sciences is open. Physicists who try to apply it there - the sociophysicists [1, 2] - are often enthusiastic [3]. Reactions of the social scientists are much more critical [4]. In the sociology, the question is formulated in more general terms. Namely, the empiricistic orientation is accepted only by part of the sociologists. Leaving aside this philosophical aspect of discussion, here we are interested to what extent the concept of temperature can be directly applied in sociology. In the statistical mechanics, the temperature is a measure of the mean kinetic energy of particles. However, there is no direct equivalent of energy in social sciences. We expect intuitively that at high temperatures there is more noise and disorder. Actually, this rough interpretation motivated the use of the term 'social temperature' in classical texts [5]. Often, temperature is introduced as a disorder parameter in model formulas borrowed directly from the statistical physics [6, 7].

In a recent preprint [8], temperature of a social system was introduced as the derivative of the entropy density with respect to the amount of cooperation. This way is promising, as the entropy can be defined for any probability distribution and the concept of energy is not needed. However, the problem appears what condition should be imposed to the quantity with respect to which the derivative is calculated. Using energy, volume or number of particles we get  $1/T$ ,  $p/T$  or  $\mu/T$ , respectively, where  $T$  is the temperature,  $p$  is the pressure and  $\mu$  is the chemical potential. Then it is not clear how  $T$  is entangled in the derivative used in Ref. [8]. On the other hand, the paper [8] is full of original, new and interesting concepts (as the Dipole model), which are however not necessary if we want merely to prove that temperature can be defined quantitatively in a social system. Such a proof - as simple as possible - is our aim here. The note presented here is motivated by Ref. [8] and profits from this reference.

We consider a set of  $N$  agents, each plays one of two strategies A or B; according to the standard notation, orientations  $s_i = \pm 1$  are assigned to these strategies. Denoting by  $n$  the number of those who play A, their proportion to the whole set is  $p = n/N$ . This  $p$  is assumed to vary in time due to three processes: *i*) copying the strategy of a randomly selected agent, *ii*) random flipping, *iii*) following mass media, which suggest A. The respective rates are  $w$ ,  $q$  and  $h$ . Let us denote  $2p - 1$  by  $m$ . The equation of motion is

$$\frac{dp}{dt} = wm - qm + h \quad (1)$$

The term with  $w$  is proportional to  $m$  as to the average orientation of a randomly selected partner. The term with  $q$  is proportional to  $-m$  because a random flip decreases the average orientation. With time  $t$  rescaled, the equation becomes

$$\frac{dm}{d\tau} = (1 - y)m + x \quad (2)$$

where  $y = q/w$  and  $x = h/w$ . As the range of variable  $m$  is limited to  $\pm 1$ , the stable fixed point for  $x = 0$  is  $m = 0$  for  $y > 1$  and  $m = \pm 1$  for  $0 < y < 1$ . Switching on the influence of media with  $x$  infinitesimally small, we can define the 'zero-field' susceptibility

$$\chi = \frac{dm}{dx} \quad (3)$$

For  $y < 1$ , the susceptibility is zero. For  $y > 1$  we get

$$\chi = \frac{1}{y - 1} \quad (4)$$

what is close to the so-called paramagnetic susceptibility [9]. On the other hand, the correlation function  $f = \langle \sum_i s_i \sum_j s_j \rangle - \langle \sum_i s_i \rangle^2$  at  $x = 0$  is equal to zero for  $y < 1$ , and  $f = N$  for  $y > 1$ . Then, from the fluctuation-dissipation theorem

$$\chi = \frac{\beta}{N} f \quad (5)$$

we obtain the temperature  $T = 1/\beta$ . For  $y < 1$  the temperature remains undefined. For  $y > 1$  we get

$$T = y - 1 = \frac{q - w}{w} \quad (6)$$

The interpretation is that temperature is the excess of the rate  $q$  of the random changing of strategy over the rate  $w$  of the deterministic majority rule, in  $w$  units.

Concluding, the fluctuation-dissipation theorem offers a simple way of the quantitative interpretation of the social temperature. A question remains, if this concept - temperature as randomness - will be qualified as useful by the social scientists. This seems possible, if the sociophysicists are able to show how in human life the randomness spreads from one event to another through a chain of consequences, in a way similar to the equalization of temperature in physics.

## References

- [1] B. K. Chakrabarti, A. Chakraborti and A. Chatterjee (Eds.), *Econophysics and Sociophysics. Trends and Perspectives*, Wiley - VCH, Weinheim 2006.
- [2] C. Castellano, S. Fortunato and V. Loreto, *Statistical physics of social dynamics*, arXiv:0710.3256.
- [3] including this author.
- [4] K. Kułakowski, *Around the gap between the sociophysics and the sociology*, arXiv:0711.2880.

- [5] D. Stauffer and S. Solomon, *Applications of Physics and Mathematics to Social Science*, arXiv:0801.0121.
- [6] H. S. Wio, M. S. de la Lama and J. M. López, *Contrarian-like behavior and system size stochastic resonance in an opinion spreading model*, Physica A 371 (2006) 108.
- [7] K. Kacperski and J. A. Holyst, *Opinion formation model with strong leader and external impact: a mean field approach*, Physica A 269 (1999) 511.
- [8] L. M. Floría, C. Gracia-Lázaro, J. Gómez-Gardeñes and Y. Moreno, *Social network reciprocity as a phase transition in evolutionary cooperation*, arXiv:0806.4962.
- [9] C. Kittel, *Introduction to Solid State Physics*, J. Wiley and Sons Inc., 1996.